Polyeideia

Harder, A

Published in:
Classical philology

Publication date:
2003

Although it is not long, the commentary could be further condensed. Textual discussions sometimes repeat too much material verbatim from the translation and footnotes (e.g., p. 86, n. 14, and pp. 108–9; p. 94, n. 25, and pp. 125–26) or from elsewhere in the volume (pp. 173–74), when a cross-reference would be more appropriate. For most of the texts (not in text 2 for some reason) G. helpfully embeds bibliographic references for fragments in the translations (e.g., p. 83: "Philochorus . . . says the following . . . [*FGrH* 328 F159]"), and then sometimes repeats these references in the endnotes without adding any additional information. More editions should be added to the end bibliography of frequently cited ancient authors to avoid repeating these bibliographic details multiple times in the notes. Those who read the volume straight through will also notice other minor formatting problems and inconsistencies. The treatment of the lemmata differs from text 2 to text 3. Some of the notes to text 5 make numerous specific references to individual lines, but the reader has to count and number the twenty-six lines of text for herself. For the *recto* of text 6, on the other hand, G. adopts a new system of numbering and translating each line of text individually, and he keys his commentary to those numbers. The lemmata in the appendix are similarly keyed to line numbers, but G.'s text prints as many as twenty-one lines without indicating any line breaks.

G. has made a body of relatively obscure material very accessible. This is the first full English translation of and commentary on the important Didymus papyrus, and it will serve as a valuable resource for scholars interested in these ancient commentaries. G. has succeeded in showing his audience various Demosthenic commentators at work. The volume has been carefully proofread[13] and the bibliography and indexes are thorough and accurate.

Judson Herrman
Bowdoin College

13. I noticed very few errors: p. 107: read "4.59" for "1.59"; p. 110: read "6.23" for "6.22"; p. 113: read "11.5–14" for "11.7–14"; p. 125: "(ed. Seel)" should be in the previous line; pp. 158–60: the Demosthenic references are inconsistently formatted.

Polyeideia: *The* Iambi *of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition.* By BENJAMIN ACOSTA-HUGHES. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2002. Pp. [xv] + 351. $65.00.

In this book Benjamin Acosta-Hughes offers a new literary study of Callimachus' *Iambi* with the aim of furthering the appreciation of these poems and of placing them in their poetic and cultural tradition. The iambs are grouped thematically and each chapter consists of an introduction, text with translation and selective critical apparatus, and an extensive discussion. A.-H. omits only *Iambi* 8, 9, and 10, which, given the fragmentary state of these poems, is understandable, although the focus on generic innovation in the book would have justified at least a brief discussion of these generically intriguing poems. The text is basically Pfeiffer's, but the results of more recent scholarship have been incorporated. At the end of the book are an extensive bibliography and three indexes.

In his introduction (pp. 1–20) A.-H. draws attention to the way in which Alexandrian poets in the third century B.C.E. were innovating the old literary genres and sometimes even managed to create a revival of lost genres like the iambic poetry of Archilochus and Hipponax. However, whereas the iambs of the Archaic poets were invective, didactic, or critical, and characterized by a language and imagery that was low or even sordid, Alexandrian iambic poetry was written for a literate audience in an ambience very different from that of ancient Ionia. A.-H. shows how Callimachus was aware of this change and exploited it in order to create a new kind of iambic poetry suited to the demands and interests of his own age: "a varied collection of poems (in form, meter, and dialect) which interweave the traditional and the innovative, the elevated and the low, and which all have some antecedents in an iambic tradition while at the same time refashioning and redefining that tradition" (p. 9).

As to the size and structure of the *Iambi* A.-H. argues convincingly that the collection was structured in the manner of the later Roman poetry books and that there were several organizing principles, such as meter, dialect, and theme. Another important structuring device was the treatment of poetics, which helped to frame the collection between *Iambi* 1 and 13. The way in which *Iambi* 1 and 13 form a pair is rightly considered as an important argument in favor of an original collection of thirteen iambs.

In chapter 1 (pp. 21–59) A.-H. discusses *Iambi* 1. The focus of his discussion is the way in which Callimachus adapts his Archaic predecessor Hipponax to his own purposes. On the one hand Callimachus picks up the tradition about Hipponax as an arbiter of aesthetics who criticized the sculptors Bupalus and Athenis and the painter Mimnes; on the other hand he refers to the tradition of his aggressive moral judgments. Thus Hipponax becomes an example of ethical and aesthetic criticism, addressing the quarrelling Alexandrian scholars and poets while leaving behind the old quarrel with Bupalus. The Hipponactean persona is carefully designed to draw the reader's attention to the renewal of the old genre in which the Archaic poet coincides with the Alexandrian *poeta doctus* and addresses his quarreling colleagues.

In chapter 2 (pp. 60–103) A.-H. shows how *Iambi* 13 is the companion piece of *Iambi* 1, as both poems feature the relation between Callimachus and the Archaic iambic tradition against a background of traveling in time and place. Whereas in *Iambi* 1 Hipponax made his appearance in Alexandria and scolded the scholars, here the fact that Callimachus writes poetry in the Hipponactean style in Alexandria without visiting Ephesus in the sixth century B.C.E. is one of the central issues, and the speaker becomes the *object* of aesthetic criticism and invective. Another issue is Callimachus' *polyeideia,* of which, as A.-H. astutely observes, the hymnic beginning of the poem immediately bears witness, being as it were emblematic of the way in which in the *Iambi* the old low genre is elevated to a higher level. An important message of the poem is that Callimachus shows how as a truly inspired poet he is able to ignore the boundaries of time, space, and genre.

In chapter 3 (pp. 104–51) A.-H. discusses the paradigmatic *Iambi* 12 and the story of the cup of Bathycles, told by Hipponax in *Iambi* 1. In contrast with *Iambi* 2 and 4, which are also paradigmatic, but where the fables present a picture of a "low" genre, the paradigmata in *Iambi* 1 and 12 are of an elevated nature. In *Iambi* 1 each of the Seven Sages modestly yields the cup of Bathycles to his colleague; in *Iambi* 12 the gods vie with each other in bringing precious presents to the newborn

Hebe. In both poems the competition is benign and constructive. Besides, in *Iambi* 12 the performance of Apollo, who offers a song to the baby, is important, as it encompasses the role of the god of poetry as well as that of the Alexandrian poet, who uses him as an example. By thus combining poet and god Callimachus greatly enhances the poem's authority and seems to set the scene for the opening invocation of *Iambi* 13. In *Iambi* 1 the story of the cup of Bathycles serves as an example for the quarreling literati of Alexandria and the fact that eventually the cup is dedicated to Apollo indicates that the combined authority of Hipponax and Apollo is symbolic of Callimachus' renewal of Archaic iambic poetry.

In chapter 4 (pp. 152–204) A.-H. deals with *Iambi* 2 and 4, which are characterized by the paradigmatic use of fable and thus present a contrast to the more elevated paradigmata of *Iambi* 1 and 12. Important aspects of Callimachus' innovative use of the fable are the ways in which he exploits the universally applicable stories to illustrate his own interests and uses material from low culture in discussions of literary criticism, thus, as it were, reinventing the genre. Like Hipponax, Aesop too is thus incorporated into the scholarly world of Alexandria and used to valorize Callimachus' poetics. As to the contents of the fables, in *Iambi* 2 the notion of "sound" seems to be important and recalls issues from the *Aetia* prologue, whereas in *Iambi* 4 we have an agonistic fable, which seems to convey the message that simple and subtle is better than grand and, as A.-H. well observes, by means of its mythological references in the *agon* reminds the reader of several other works of Callimachus.

In chapter 5 (pp. 205–64) A.-H. discusses *Iambi* 3 and 5, in which ethical behavior is a central element. In this respect too Callimachus is taking up issues from Archaic iambic poetry, in which ethical criticism was an important element, often with the speaker as the victim. Thus we find in *Iambi* 3 the speaker as an *erastes* who has been rejected because of his poverty and is a victim of his mercenary lover as well as of his own passion. Besides, the themes of poverty, poetry, and love are closely connected and relate the poem to the search for patronage of the Alexandrian poet and to the world of the Hellenistic epigram. Thus we see again a combination of the Archaic genre with contemporary elements as well as an effective "crossing of genres," and *Iambi* 3 is rightly regarded by A.-H. as emblematic of the whole collection of iambs. In *Iambi* 5 we find a combination of criticism and advice, familiar from Archilochus and Hipponax, but in a new setting, because the teacher who is being accused of indecent behavior towards his pupils represents a new kind of profession within iambic poetry, fitting in with a generally critical attitude towards teachers in the Hellenistic period.

The last chapter (pp. 265–303) deals with *Iambi* 6, 7, and 9, which are all about statues of cult figures and are of interest from an ecphrastic, aetiological, and didactic point of view. Although these poems have received a certain amount of attention individually, A.-H. is the first to discuss them systematically as a group. In the earlier iambic tradition we find only simple objects, although there is some evidence of attention to visual objects in Hipponax. Callimachus' treatment of serious art (such as the famous statue of Olympian Zeus by Phidias) in his iambs is therefore an innovation, and the way in which he extends his descriptions to include the "history" of the objects is another new element. The presentation of the descriptions may also be related to the conventions of dedicatory epigrams, so that again the iambic tradition is renewed by the combination with elements from another genre.

At the end of the book one misses a concluding chapter in which the results of the preceding chapters are summarized and a general evaluation of Callimachus' *Iambi* is offered. This is a pity, but there is enough to compensate for this omission. The book is well written and the arguments are presented lucidly and convincingly. A.-H. has an acute view of the issues that were important in Callimachus' poetry and is well able to show how these are presented in the *Iambi*. This applies particularly to the way in which he deals with issues of generic innovation and the metapoetical aspects of the texts. These issues are, as it were, the focus of his book, and in this respect it forms a neat complement to A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of "Iambi"* (Oxford, 1999), which focuses more on the speakers as such and on the collection as a whole. An interesting result of A.-H.'s approach is that conclusions reached on generic and metapoetical aspects of Callimachus' literary technique in the *Hymns* and the *Aetia* can now be fruitfully compared to the *Iambi*. A.-H.'s observations about the way in which Callimachus elevates the iambic genre to the higher level of the *poeta doctus* are convincing as well as intriguing, and here some general conclusions would have been particularly welcome. In this respect it would also have been interesting to hear what A.-H. thinks of the fact that in spite of this elevation the *Iambi* apparently did not contain explicit references to the Ptolemies, as did the *Hymns* and the *Aetia*.

A slight drawback of the thematic presentation is that one loses sight of the way in which the poems also derived meaning from their position within the collection and of the impact of the collection as a whole. Even so, A.-H. often draws the reader's attention to this aspect of the *Iambi,* for example, when he discusses the way in which *Iambi* 1 and 13 frame the collection or the contrasts between "high" and "low" that permeate both the individual poems and the collection as a whole.

Throughout the book we find detailed discussion and astute observations to which this review cannot really do justice, and for which I warmly recommend A.-H.'s book to all readers with an interest in Hellenistic literature.

Some comments on details: in A.-H.'s translations the Greek letters used to indicate words broken off in the papyrus look odd; the use of three kinds of *sigma* is confusing and seemingly arbitrary (see, e.g., p. 162 ad 74, p. 168 ad 5–6); pp. 3–4 (and p. 85): the question of the order of the *Aetia* and *Iambi* is more complex than A.-H. admits; p. 15: one may now add the translation by F. Nisetich, *The Poems of Callimachus* (Oxford, 2001), 96–121; A.-H. rightly stresses the need for a comprehensive commentary on the *Iambi,* but it would be best to undertake this job not *after,* but *while* reediting the fragments; pp. 37–41: on *persona,* also in Callimachus, see now M. A. Harder and R. R. Nauta, eds., *Lampas* 35.5 (2002), with various contributions on the subject; p. 40: ambiguity of identity of the poetic voice is also a characteristic of the *Aetia;* p. 53: A.-H.'s decision to discuss the story of the cup of Bathycles in a later chapter is not entirely felicitous, as it is obviously an integral part of *Iambi* 1; pp. 85–89: it may be relevant to notice that Plato's *Ion* is also evoked in the *Aetia* prologue frag. 1.32; pp. 106–13: A.-H.'s treatment of the new readings of Parsons, Coles, and Rea is not entirely consistent: it is not clear why he adopts them in his text in lines 17 and 29, but not in 20 and 38, and why Rea's attractive suggestion in 43 is not mentioned in the apparatus, but only on p. 133; p. 107, ad 20: the word order implied by the new reading of Coles and Rea seems difficult; pp. 118–19 = 30–31; p. 123: on the role of children and young people in Callimachus' poetry, see now

A. Ambuehl, "Kinder und junge Helden" (Ph.D. diss., University of Basel, 2001); p. 170: on fables in ancient literature, see now G.-J.van Dijk, AINOI, MYΘOI, ΛOΓOI (Leiden, 1997); p. 203: line 27 does not seem to justify the conclusion that the Pythia sings of the laurel as opposed to the birds who speak about the olive's qualities (the translation "laurel does she sing" on p. 161 is more accurate); p. 204: a question that remains concerning *Iambi* 4 is why the arrogant laurel is associated with Callimachus and Apollo; p. 243: it should be noticed that in Callimachus the notion of unresponsive gods is not restricted to the *Iambi;* cf., e.g., Triopas' prayer to Poseidon in *Hymn* 6.96–110; p. 249, n. 81: concerning the issue of hetero- versus homosexual love in Callimachus, one should take into consideration that evidence for heterosexual relations comes largely from *Aetia* 3–4 (from which one may add frags. 80–83 about Phrygius and Pieria) and may be related to Ptolemaic kingship ideology, an issue that seems to be absent in the *Iambi;* p. 261: on schoolteachers as an object of scorn in the Hellenistic period, see I. Sluiter, "*Perversa Subtilitas:* De kwade roep van de grammaticus," *Lampas* 21 (1988): 41–65; p. 288: the range of geographical locations in the *Iambi* may be compared to that in the *Aetia;* p. 290, n. 35: it seems to have escaped A.-H.'s notice that fragment 176.5 is now part of *SH* 257.25 and refers to unpruned young branches; p. 293: to prove his point about the connection with the *Aetia* in 46, A.-H. could have mentioned *Aetia* fragment 43.84–85.

Despite these individual considerations, however, A.-H.'s book is an important contribution not only to the study of Callimachus' *Iambi* but to Callimachean scholarship in general. His new conclusions about the *Iambi* open up new vistas and invite further research in various aspects of Callimachus' other works as well.

Annette Harder
University of Groningen

Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal. By KIRK FREUDENBURG. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. [xviii] + 289. $70.00 (cloth); $25.00 (paper).

Studies of Roman satire often proceed under the assumption that Juvenal is the pinnacle of the genre, from which perspective Horace is viewed as somewhat anaemic, Persius as bizarre, and Lucilius, while outspoken, as too fragmentary for detailed consideration. Perhaps it has something to do with the later tradition of satire, in which, although the Horatian variety features prominently, it is the Juvenalian strain that is most loudly heard. One striking feature of Kirk Freudenburg's study is that it reverses the traditional order of things, positing Lucilius as the center, and paying much more attention to both Horace and Persius than to Juvenal, who occupies a marginal position at the end of the book. So, we are invited to look differently at the genre of satire and the critical narrative that makes this collection of texts a genre for us.

In his introduction, F. raises the perennial question, what is satire? He focuses on the disjunction we sense in reading Horace through categories established by Lucilius and suggests that all three successors of the originator lose the battle against him, rather as Ovid, Statius, and Lucan lose in the realm of epic to Virgil. Satire performs an identity crisis of the male elite self, as the aggressive freedom of speech